DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 592 CS 507 914

AUTHOR Ikeda, Tomoko; Beebe, Steven A.
TITLE A Review of Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy: Implications for Intercultural Research.
PUB DATE May 92
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (42nd, Miami, FL, May 20-25, 1992).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; *Communication Research; *Cultural Differences; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Intercultural Communication; Literature Reviews; *Nonverbal Communication; Research Needs; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Communication Behavior; *Teacher Immediacy

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews research which has focused upon teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors, and notes implications for additional research which considers culture as a key research variable. Specifically, the paper: (1) reviews and discusses previous research which has investigated nonverbal communication in classrooms, with an emphasis on teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior; (2) highlights cultural variables that are likely to affect nonverbal communication in instructional contexts; (3) reviews and evaluates the previous research in intercultural nonverbal communication; (4) reviews and evaluates studies which have investigated intercultural aspects of teacher nonverbal communication behavior; and (5) offers suggestions for further research. Seventy-nine references are attached. (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349592

A Review of Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy: Implications for Intercultural Research

Tomoko Ikeda, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

and

Steven A. Beebe, Southwest Texas State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Steven Beebe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS507414

A paper presented at the
Intercultural Communication Conference, Miami, Florida
May, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Review of Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy: Implications for Intercultural Research

Teaching is a communicative act. A teacher's communicative behavior encompasses both verbal and nonverbal dimensions. Several researchers have emphasized the importance of teacher nonverbal behavior. Morain (1978) states that "Emotions, feelings, and interpersonal attitudes are often more effectively expressed by the nonverbal than by the verbal" (p. 19). Mehrabian (1971) concluded that in some contexts only 7 percent of emotion is conveyed verbally and 93 percent of emotion is expressed through nonverbal cues. Barnlund (1989) states that physical cues may be more reliable indicators of people's attitudes than what they verbalize as their attitudes. According to Galloway (1971), "Nonverbal cues in general are both less manageable and more revealing than verbal cues" (p. 312). Nonverbal behaviors are important because they are taken by others as signs of the psychological state of the communicator.

Given the importance of the nonverbal dimension of human interaction, it is critical that teacher nonverbal behavior is brought to the level of conscious awareness. The recognition of the importance of nonverbal cues by teachers should enhance their ability to relate to all students (Seals & Kaufman, 1975). Without being aware of their own nonverbal behaviors, which tend to be conveyed unconsciously, teachers cannot analyze and understand the process of classroom communication. As Love and Roderick (1971) argue, teachers need to be able to identify, analyze, and if necessary, modify their own nonverbal behavior in order to be effective. In this light, researchers have studied the impact of teacher nonverbal behavior as well as the verbal dimension on various forms of student learning outcomes.

There is one important element that seems to be missing from the concerns of the past nonverbal instructional communication research; that is, culture. Many communication models include context as one of their variables. If communication is impossible without context, it necessarily involves culture. Culture and communication are inseparable. As Samovar and Porter (1988) stated, our entire repertory of communicative behaviors is dependent largely on

the culture in which we have been raised. Culture is the foundation of communication and meaning.

Leathers (1986) defines culture as "those values, beliefs, customs, rules, laws, and communicative behaviors that can be used to differentiate one social group from another" (p. 256). According to Leathers, one culture is differentiated from another on the basis of difference rather than similarity. This is particularly interesting because interpersonal attraction theories hold that people are attracted to those who are similar to themselves. This suggests that people should behave differently when interacting with a person from another culture than with a person from their own culture. In fact, there has been a considerable amount of research focused on the various intercultural aspects of communication, particularly, in interpersonal contexts.

One of these aspects which have been studied in the light of intercultural perspective is nonverbal communication. Samovar and Porter (1988) note that the relationship between culture and nonverbal behaviors could be categorized in two ways. First, "culture tends to determine the specific nonverbal behaviors that represent or symbolize specific thoughts, feelings, or states of the communicator" (p. 270). Second, "culture determines when it is appropriate to display or communicate various thoughts, feelings, or internal states" (p. 270). Similarly, Collier (1988) pointed out that "outcomes resulting from rule following and rule violating behavior may reflect the rules and outcomes from one of the culture groups represented" (p. 124). Therein lies the inherent difficulty in processing nonverbal codes in intercultural encounters. The nonverbal expectancy violations model (Burgoon & Hale, 1988) assumes that people hold expectations and preferences about the nonverbal behaviors of others, and these expectations are based upon the cultural backgrounds of the interactants. A message encoded in one culture must be decoded according to another culture's interpretation rules.

Even though culture is understood to play a mediating role in communication, most of the previous research conducted on teacher nonverbal communication deals with culturally homogeneous classrooms. There are very few studies which took cultural variables into consideration. Given the increasing cultural diversity in today's educational settings, it is

imperative that more research is conducted from an intercultural perspective. If a teacher and students do not share the same culture, the likelihood of communication problems becomes greater, and student learning may be hindered.

The purpose of this paper is to review research which has focused upon teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors and to note implications for additional research which considers culture as a key research variable. Specifically, this paper will: (1) review and discuss previous research which has investigated nonverbal communication in classrooms, with an emphasis on teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior; (2) highlight cultural variables that are likely to affect nonverbal communication in instructional contexts; (3) review and evaluate the previous research in intercultural nonverbal communication; (4) review and evaluate studies which have investigated intercultural aspect of teacher nonverbal communication behavior; and (5) offer suggestions for the future research.

The Importance of Teacher Nonverbal Behavior

Several studies and research reviews document the importance of teacher nonverbal variables in instructional settings (cf. Smith, 1979; Beebe, 1986, Richey & Richey, 1978; Galloway, 1974). Earlier studies of teacher nonverbal behavior tend to have been less specific as to the kinds of nonverbal cues they investigated. For example, Woolfolk and Woolfolk (1974) investigated the effects of a teacher's vocal, facial, postural channels which inflected friendliness, approval, or considerateness on students' perceptions of and attraction toward the teacher. The verbal channel was found to have greater impact than the nonverbal. Galloway (1974) attributed this unpredicted finding to the lack of a precise measure of nonverbal behavior independent of verbal influence. Seals and Kaufman (1975) examined the impact of the amount of teacher nonverbal behavior on college students' attitudes. Results indicated that the students who were in the "still" group had the least favorable attitude toward the instructor, whereas the students who attended the "active" presentation which utilized frequent nonverbal cues held the most favorable attitudes toward the instructor. Willett (1976) found that teacher

nonverbal behavior is a distinguishing characteristic when highly rated teachers are compared to lower rated teachers.

It is also noticeable that a number of earlier studies called for the need for teachers to become aware of their own nonverbal behavior, and the need for teacher training programs in this regard. French (1971) presented a model for preservice teacher education and inservice professional growth programs in which he emphasized the importance of analyzing nonverbal messages of teachers as well as those of students and classroom environment. Love and Roderick (1971) conducted a training for elementary and secondary school teachers and found that nonverbal behavior of the teachers could be changed in both frequency and kinds of behavior used through the completion of a series of tasks.

Based upon the previous research in teacher nonverbal behavior and Mehrabian's concept of "immediacy" (1969), Andersen (1978) developoed the construct "teacher immediacy." Among those teacher communicative behaviors which have been investigated in relation to student learning, nonverbal immediacy is the focus of this paper. In the following section, the literature on teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior will be reviewed and evaluated.

Review of the Literature on Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy

Immediacy is defined by Mehrabian (1969) as communicative behaviors that "enhance closeness to and nonverbal interaction with another" (p. 203). People's approach-avoidance patterns can be understood in terms of the principle "People are drawn toward persons and things they like, evaluate highly, and prefer; and they avoid or move away from things they dislike, evaluate negatively, or do not prefer" (Mehrabian, 1971, p. 1). According to Andersen, Norton, and Nussbaum (1981), immediacy behaviors operate to "reduce distance between people by either decreasing actual physical distance or psychological distance" (p. 378).

Affective/Behavioral Learning. A number of studies have investigated teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior in terms of its effects on learning outcomes over the past decade. Specifically, three domains of student learning have been examined repeatedly:

affective, behavioral, and cognitive. Andersen (1979) investigated the relationship between teacher immediacy and teaching effectiveness (i.e., affective, behavioral, and cognitive student learning). The following nonverbal communication behaviors were included in teacher immediacy: close physical distance, direct body orientation, relaxed body position, purposeful body movement, gestures, head nods, smiles, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness. These teacher immediacy behaviors were found to be good predictors of student affect toward the course instructor and content, and of student behavioral commitment. However, no relationship was found between teacher immediacy and cognitive learning as operationalized by the test scores.

Andersen, Norton, and Nussbaum (1981) examined teacher immediacy, communicator style, and student affective and cognitive learning. Teacher immediacy was found to be significantly related to teacher communicator style. The "friendly" style was the best predictor of generalized immediacy. Students viewed immediate teachers as being more effective, and reported greater positive affect toward the instructor and the course itself. However, again, the relationship of teacher communication behaviors to cognitive learning was not significant. The positive impact of teacher nonverbal immediacy on affective learning was confirmed by Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, and Richmond (1986) who found that student affect was primarily a function of perceptions of teacher nonverbal immediacy.

Immediacy Across Different Types of Courses. Teacher nonverbal immediacy has been demonstrated to have a positive effect on student affective learning across different types of college classes. Kearney, Plax, and Wendt-Wasco (1985) examined teacher immediacy as potential indicators of student affective learning in divergent courses, that is, people-oriented (P-Type) content classes (e.g., communication, psychology, and sociology) and task-oriented (T-Type) classes (e.g., computer science, math, and accounting). Teacher nonverbal immediacy was positively related to student affective learning in both P-Type and T-Type courses. However, students in T-Type classes preferred teachers who were organized, structured, and controlled in their classroom orientation. Thus, the actual magnitude of the impact of teacher immediacy on student affective learning and perception of the relative

importance of immediacy was a function of the type of course content. A related study was conducted by Stewart and Wheeless (1987) who examined student perception of teacher immediacy in two divergent student samples (i.e., "traditional" college students and "less traditional" student pilots at a U.S. Air Force base). They found that the relationship between perceived teacher immediacy and student/teacher solidarity did not differ across the two samples, and further suggested that student perception of these constructs could be generalizable to instructional contexts other than the traditional college classroom.

Cognitive Learning. Some researchers isolated the cognitive domain of student learning as a dependent variable and attempted to clarify its less clear relationship to teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior. Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1987) employed a subjective measure of cognitive learning to investigate the effectiveness of teacher nonverbal immediacy. Students themselves estimated the amount they learned in a given class. These researchers found that teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors were substantially associated with cognitive learning. Vocal expressiveness, smiling at the class, and having a relaxed body position were deemed particularly important. Looking at the class and moving around the classroom also seemed to make a meaningful contribution. Richmond et al. (1987) suggested that the association between cognitive learning and immediacy was nonlinear, unlike that between affective learning and immediacy. Moderate immediacy seems necessary for cognitive learning and low immediacy may suppress such learning, but "high immediacy may not increase cognitive learning over that generated by moderate immediacy" (p. 587). Employing student perceptions of their own learning, Gorham and Zakahi (1990) also found a positive effect of teacher immediacy on student cognitive learning. Kelley and Gorham (1988) investigated the effects of immediacy on cognitive learning by looking at the level of short-term recall of the information presented in an experimental situation. A combination of eye contact and physical immediacy (a condition in which an experimenter sat close to the subjects and utilized head nods while administering the test) produced positive results on short-term recall. Kelly and Gorham (1988) suggested that the addition of other immediacy behaviors might strike at the same mechanism in the same way and produce similar beneficial results. Stewart (1989) found

that the expressive vocal cues, frequent smiles, and demonstrative gestures had a positive effect on simple recall tasks when combined with students' notetaking, but they alone did not have a significant impact.

Mediated Instruction. Another stream of research investigating teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior in different types of classrooms is that of mediated instruction. Andersen and Withrow (1981) examined the impact of a lecturer's nonverbal expressiveness in videotaped instruction. The nonverbal expressiveness of the lecturer was found to have a positive effect on college student affective learning. In short, students liked the lecturer and the videotaped message when the message was delivered in a nonverbally immediate manner. On the other hand, no significant effects were found on cognitive learning or behavioral learning by varying the degree of teacher nonverbal expressiveness. Hackman and Walker (1990) also investigated the effects of teacher immediacy behavior on student learning and satisfaction in the televised classroom. They found that both verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy behavior had a strong impact on student learning as measured by asking the students to assess how much they believed they learned in a given class, and on student satisfaction with the instructor. Among the teacher nonverbal behaviors examined, using vocal variety was found to be the most important factor in promoting perceived learning in mediated instruction. A teacher's use of a relaxed body posture and vocal variety were related to satisfaction with the course and the instructor. Smiling was correlated with satisfaction with the instructor. Hackman and Walker (1990) concluded that these immediate physical behaviors enhanced feelings of contact or the degree of "social presence," which is a key to effective mediated instruction.

Monitoring Immediacy. Some studies investigated teachers' ability to monitor their own nonverbal immediacy behavior. Gorham and Zakahi (1990) were interested in whether teachers could accurately assess the level of immediacy they projected in the classroom. Comparison of teacher and student perceptions revealed that teachers were highly aware of their use of immediacy behaviors. Furthermore, teachers' perceptions of learning outcomes agreed with their students' perceptions; teachers were able to monitor both the process and product

components of instruction. These findings have important implications for improving teaching effectiveness (Gorham & Zakahi, 1990) since a "primary prerequisite for change is the recognition of need" (p. 356). The issue of teacher training is particularly relevant here. Klinzing, Fitzner, and Klinzing-Eurich (1983) conducted a training program on expressive nonverbal behavior and found the trainability of nonverbal sensitivity. Similarly, Nussbaum (1983) investigated the effectiveness of a teacher training program which was designed to modify teacher nonverbal behavior. As a result of the program which utilized a videotape, teachers succeeded in employing such behaviors as gestures, eye contact, and moving away form the desk. Moreover, as these behaviors were modified, student cognitive learning, as measured by achievement scores, and student evaluations of teaching effectiveness were also improved.

Verbal and Nonverbal Immediacy. Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, and Richmond (1986) attempted to clarify the role of teacher nonverbal immediacy in the use of verbal control strategies and students' attitudes toward learning environment. These researchers found that students' affect was primarily a function of perceptions of teacher nonverbal immediacy. They also suggested that teacher nonverbal immediacy orientation might influence students' perceptions of teachers' use of verbal control strategies. Students are likely to perceive that immediate teachers rely on prosocial Behavioral Alteration Techniques. Kearney, Plax, Smith, and Sorensen (1988) confirmed a dominant influence of teacher nonverbal immediacy over verbal strategies. Student resistance to on-task demands was a function of teacher nonverbal immediacy regardless of teachers' verbal strategy choice. Specifically, an immediate teacher who employed prosocial strategies to gain student compliance was resisted less than an immediate teacher who used antisocial techniques. However, a nonimmediate teacher who employed prosocial techniques was resisted more than a nonimmediate teacher who used antisocial strategies. In short, nonverbal immediacy cues projected by the teacher had more impact than verbal cues.

Immediacy Behavior of Highly Effective Teachers. Nussbaum, Comadena, and Holladay (1985) described verbal and nonverbal behaviors of highly effective teachers who

had been recognized by the university as outstanding teachers. The observation utilizing videotape revealed that the nonverbal behaviors of highly effective teachers differed from those of the teachers yet to be recognized as effective. More specifically, the highly effective teacher spent a majority of their time away from the desk, oriented directly toward the class, often moving about the room with an extreme use of illustrative activity, and spent a majority of their class time gazing at the class. The research team concluded that "the effective teachers were judged as more immediate within the classroom than the ineffective teachers" (p. 17).

Teacher Characteristics. Gorham and Zakahi (1990) found that teacher affect toward teaching was not related to immediacy. Liking teaching apparently does not necessarily result in high immediacy. They also found that teacher experience was not related to their ability to monitor their immediacy behavior accurately.

Motivation. Recently, some researchers have started investigating the effects of teacher nonverbal immediacy in terms of student motivation. Richmond (1990) investigated the relationship between teacher nonverbal immediacy and student motivation, and found that the degree to which immediacy accounted for motivation was approximately double that accounted for by teachers' power base or Behavioral Alteration Techniques. Vocal variety, smiling, and eye contact appeared to be the major contributors. Richmond (1990) suggested that "the critical link between teachers' communicative behaviors and student learning may be the impact of those behaviors on student motivation" (p. 194). Christophel (1990) also examined the role of teacher immediacy behaviors in relation to student motivation. Teacher immediacy was found to influence student learning both directly and indirectly. For categories such as positive affect toward the instructor, immediacy had a direct impact on affective learning. For other categories, teacher immediacy had an indirect impact. Immediacy appeared to modify student motivation first, which led to increased learning. The kind of motivation affected by teacher immediacy was state motivation (i.e., an attitude toward a specific class) as opposed to trait motivation (i.e., a general, enduring predisposition toward learning). When compared to verbal immediacy, nonverbal immediacy was found to have a greater impact on learning.

Theoretical Framework. While a number of studies have made an attempt to investigate and confirm relationships between teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior and learning outcomes, and offered prescriptive suggestions for teachers (e.g., Richey & Richey, 1978) an effort to provide theoretical explanation that links these research findings to a unified set of principles has been scarce. Beebe and Biggers (1990) nominated Mehrabian's implicit communication theory as a "theoretical framework that holds promise for explaining teacher-student interaction in the classroom" (p. 5). "Teacher behavior in the classroom (especially nonverbal behavior) arouses emotional meanings in students" (p. 18), therefore, implicit communication theory which explains three dimensions that are both necessary and sufficient to describe any emotional state is appropriate. These three dimensions are: (1) pleasure-displeasure, (2) arousal-nonarousal, and (3) dominance-submissiveness. Beebe and Biggers (1990) applied these dimensions to explain the relationships between teacher behavior and student learning outcomes.

The most direct test of implicit communication theory to explain the effects of teacher immediacy cues on student learning was conducted by Butland (1991). This study replicated Gorham's (1988) research, but also measured students' emotional responses to teacher immediacy behavior in implicit communication terms (Mehrabian's approach-avoidance metaphor). Results of the study replicated Gorham's (1988) findings, significantly linking teacher verbal and nonverbal immediacy to gains in student learning. However, when immediacy constructs were replaced with scales tapping the dimensions of pleasure, arousal, and dominance, results were more illuminating. Student responses on pleasure and arousal scales accounted for over one-half of the variance of learning in this study. The combined results for immediacy and for pleasure and arousal dimensions only increased the variance explained by two percent (52% total variance explained). Thus, Butland (1991) provides evidence to document the explanatory power of implicit communication theory with regard to the teaching-learning relationship. Teacher behavior appears to affect students emotionally, and students' emotional responses to teachers are linked not only to perceptions about the teacher, but also to the amount of learning that occurs.

Summary of Immediacy Research

Teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior and its relationship to student learning have been investigated over the past decade. Taken together, as Gorham and Zakahi (1990) concluded, this line of research has indicated that "decreased physical and/or psychological distance between teachers and students is associated with enhanced learning outcomes" (p. 354). From the beginning, teacher nonverbal immediacy has been found to have a positive impact on student affective learning which is typically operationalized as attitudes toward the instructor, course content, and recommendations made in the course. However, the relationship between nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning has been less consistent. Student cognitive learning has been operationalized in many ways (e.g., test scores, recall of material, student perceptions of their own learning).

Recent research has indicated that the relationship between immediacy and cognitive learning is mediated through other factors such as motivation and arousal/attention effects. Therefore, researchers have pointed out that while this relationship may not be as simple and direct as that of immediacy to affective learning, immediacy directly or indirectly affects cognitive learning: immediate teachers are likely to enhance learning in all three domains.

The impact of teacher immediacy has been confirmed across courses that are different in the types of content and in the form of instruction (e.g., face-to-face vs. televised). As for the verbal and nonverbal dimensions of teacher immediacy behavior, nonverbal immediacy has been found to be a more dominant source of influence on student learning. Some studies have investigated teachers' ability to monitor their immediacy behavior, and results have been encouraging. In this light, validity of teacher training programs designed to improve teaching through modification of nonverbal immediacy behavior has been discussed. Some research has made an effort to offer a theoretical framework to explain the effects of immediacy behavior on classroom learning. In summary, the research reviewed here supports the following observations (Butland, 1991):

1) Verbal teacher immediacy increases student cognitive learning.

2) Verbal teacher immediacy increases student affective and behavioral learning.

3) Nonverbal teacher immediacy increases student cognitive learning, and information recall.

4) Nonverbal teacher immediacy increases affective learning.

5) Nonverbal teacher immediacy increases students' perceptions of teacher effectiveness.

6) Nonverbal teacher immediacy plays a mediating role in the reception and effectiveness of teacher control strategies.

7) Verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy is significantly and positively related to perceptions of teacher clarity.

8) Teacher immediacy produces a reciprocal liking among teacher and student.

Limitations of the Previous Research on Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy

Although previous investigations in this area have contributed greatly to the better understanding of classroom interaction by studying the relationships between teacher nonverbal immediacy and learning outcomes, there are some weaknesses in the body of research.

1. There is no general agreement about how to measure student learning. Particularly, this is problematic regarding how to operationalize cognitive learning. Researchers have utilized various means including test scores, course grade, short-term recall, long-term recall, and student perceptions of how much they believed they learned. Given this variety of measurement, it is not surprising that research findings concerning the impact of teacher immediacy on cognitive learning have sometimes been inconsistent. Similarly, the operational definition of affective learning is not consistent. Typically, it is defined as student attitudes toward the instructor, the course itself, and the course content. However, some researchers have included the student attitudes toward the suggestions or recommendations made in the course. Then, the difference between affective learning and behavioral learning becomes less clear. The use of these terms needs to be clarified in the literature.

2. As for the measurement of behavioral learning, assessing it by asking students' "intent" to engage in the practice recommended in the course and to enroll in the similar course in the future seems a limited measure.

3. There seems to be a sufficient agreement among researchers who use the term "immediacy" on what it refers to, however, many other researchers who investigate teacher

communication variables under different terms are actually investigating the same construct. A unified usage of terminology in the discipline will contribute to an efficient and better understanding of teacher communication behavior.

4. Greater effort should be made to provide theoretical explanation of why students respond to specific teacher behavior in the classroom in a certain way. A number of studies have identified the relationships between teacher immediacy behavior and student learning and offered prescriptive suggestions on classroom behavior for teachers to utilize. Prescription without theoretical explanation is problematic.

5. Overwhelmingly, the majority of research has investigated teacher nonverbal immediacy as if it occurs in the classroom where no cultural difference exists among students or between a teacher and students. However, in today's culturally diverse classrooms, this is simply not the case. Researchers should consider cultural backgrounds of a teacher and students which affect the way immediacy behavior affects learning outcomes.

Cultural Variables Affecting Nonverbal Communication

There are numerous cultural variables or characteristics of cultural systems that influence communication. These schemas provide dimensions on which cultures vary that can be used theoretically to explain cultural difference (Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Chua, 1988) in communication. Some of those dimensions that seem to be relevant to nonverbal behavior will be described below.

Individualism-Collectivism. This is a major dimension of cultural variability discussed frequently by theorists (e.g., Hofstede, 1980). In individualistic cultures, emphasis is placed on individuals' goals, while group goals are more emphasized than individual goals in collectivistic cultures. In collectivistic cultures, the differentiation of ingroup and outgroup is important (Hofstede, 1980). People in individualistic cultures tend to be universalistic and apply the same value standards to all, whereas people in collectivistic cultures tend to be particularistic and apply different value standards for members of their ingroups and outgroups. This dimension is relevant to nonverbal behaviors in intercultural settings because it

is predicted that people from collectivistic cultures view the relationship between a teacher and students quite differently from people from individualistic cultures, and behave under different nonverbal communicative norms.

Low- and High-Context Communication. This schema by Hall (1976) has been extensively used by communication scholars. According to Hall, "a high-context communication or message is one in which most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message" (1976, p. 79). A low-context communication, on the other hand, is the one in which "the mass of the information is vested in the explicit code" (p. 79). This variability also is relevant to the nonverbal aspect of communication. It is likely that misunderstanding will occur because members from high-context cultures who rely heavily on nonverbal cues attempt to convey the meaning to their low-context counterparts without utilizing verbal codes. Barnlund (1989) states that verbal and nonverbal modes of communication tend to increase or decrease together; "those who are verbally more expressive tend to be nonverbally more expressive" (p. 144). People from low- and high-context cultures should behave differently in terms of nonverbal expressiveness.

Uncertainty Avoidance. This is one of the cultural dimensions that Hofstede (1980) derived empirically from a study of multinational corporations in 53 countries. In high uncertainty avoidance cultures, there is a strong tendency for consensus, and deviant behavior is not acceptable. High uncertainty avoidance cultures tend to have higher level of anxiety, display emotions more than cultures low in uncertainty avoidance. With these characteristics in mind, it is predicted that members of cultures high in uncertainty avoidance are likely to have a lower tolerance for people who demonstrate different nonverbal behaviors from theirs.

Kitao and Kitao (1988) mentioned factors affecting Japanese people's use of kinetic codes. They included: homogeneity of society, Zen Buddhism, intragroup relationships, tendency to avoid restricted subjects, and distrust of verbalization. According to Hirokawa and Miyahara (1986), Japanese and American managers have different power bases to influence their subordinates. The basis for influence for Japanese managers is identification power,

whereas the American power basis is explained in terms of reward, coercive, or legitimate power. Basically, these differences were examined regarding verbal communication, but it seems to be reasonable to think that this difference affects nonverbal behaviors of people from two countries. Morain (1978) contends that "members of the same culture share a common body idiom" (p. 11). That is, they tend to read a given nonverbal signal in the same way. "If two people read a signal in a different way, it is partial evidence that they belong to different cultures" (p. 11). Indeed, nonverbal systems seem to be determined by cultural norms.

Review of Intercultural Nonverbal Research

Numerous studies have been conducted which have investigated intercultural nonverbal communication. Setting aside essays dealing with a general concept of intercultural and nonverbal communication and review articles, these studies can be classified into three broad categories: (1) research attempting to identify nonverbal cues that are universal across cultures or unique to a particular culture; (2) research attempting to identify differences/similarities in intercultural encounters; and (3) practical applications and suggestions.

1. *Research Attempting to Identify Universal or Culture-Specific Nonverbal Cues.* This line of research does not seek to explore the dynamic process in intercultural encounters in which people from different cultures actually interact, instead, it attempts to identify what meaning is attached to a certain nonverbal cue in a particular culture. A representative example is a series of research which examined cultural differences in the judgments of facial expressions of emotion (Ekman & Friesen, 1971; Ekman, Friesen, O'Sullivan, Chan, Diacoyanni-Tarlatzis, Heider, Krause, LeCompte, Pitcairn, Ricci-Bitti, Scherer, Tomita, & Tzavaras, 1987; Garner, 1987; Keating, Mazur, Segall, Cysneiros, Divale, Kilbride, Komin, Leahy, Thurman, & Wirsing, 1981; Sweeney, Cottle, & Kobayashi, 1980). Across the studies, particular facial behaviors were found to be universally associated with particular emotions (e.g., happiness, anger, sadness, disgust, surprise, and fear).

Ekman and Friesen (1971) found that members of a preliterate culture who had been isolated from literate cultures could identify the same emotional concepts with the same faces as

members of literate Eastern and Western cultures did, except the discrimination of fear from surprise. This line of research was later elaborated by Ekman et al. (1987) by including the intensity of each emotion. Results indicated that subjects from 10 cultures agreed on their choice of the first and second most intense emotion. However, cultural differences were found in judgments of the absolute level of emotional intensity. Keating et al. (1981) found a strong universal association between smiles and happiness and a relatively weak support for a non-smiling/dominance association, but a lowered-brow/dominance association was a relatively Western concept. Sweeney et al. (1980) conducted the study using American and Japanese students enrolled in counseling course. Since it is crucial for a counselor to be able to decode facial expressions of clients properly, and the number of students from diverse cultural background is likely to continue to increase at many institutions, this kind of research is particularly important.

The studies mentioned above examined the interpretations of facial expressions across cultures. Some researchers have been particularly interested in the comparison of nonverbal communication styles of the Japanese and Americans. Kitao and Kitao (1988) described the differences in the kinetic codes of Americans and Japanese. Barnlund (1989) found a higher frequency of more intimate behavior by Americans for all types of nonverbal cues he investigated including such behavior as spacing and touching. Regarding touching, Americans demonstrated nearly twice as much contact with their close companions as Japanese did. Similar findings were obtained in the research conducted by Boyer, Thompson, Klopf, and Ishii (1990). American college students, both men and women, were found to be significantly more immediate than Japanese students although both groups held moderate degrees of immediacy. According to Sato (1991) who compared the preferred distance among Japanese and Americans, Americans tend to keep shorter distance from family members and friends than the Japanese. However, Americans need more distance from strangers than the Japanese. These studies also belong to the first category of nonverbal communication research in that they compare the meaning of specific nonverbal cues or nonverbal communication patterns used by

Americans and Japanese in intracultural settings, but do not examine the intercultural communication between them.

2. *Research Attempting to Identify Similarities/Differences in Intercultural Encounters.* This line of research is very different from the one reviewed above because it attempts to examine what happens when people from different cultures actually interact. The studies reviewed here provide a sample of the research goals and methods used to explore intercultural encounters. LaFrance and Mayo (1976, 1978) investigated differences in gaze behavior in interracial conversations. Specifically, gaze direction in communications between Blacks and Whites was examined. They found that Whites and Blacks followed the opposite patterns of gaze behavior. In White-White dyads, interactants looked at the other person while listening, and looked away while speaking. In Black-Black dyads, other-directed gaze was associated with speaking and away-gaze was associated with listening. In the interracial dyad, both Black and White operated within the gaze direction patterns of their own subcultural group, therefore created a situation in which each found the other's cues to speaker-listener role exchange misleading. The implications of these studies are of particular interest. When faced with a communication breakdown due to cultural differences, the difficulty may not be perceived as a consequence of differences, but may lead to a negative evaluation of the other person. LaFrance and Mayo state: "Misreading of subcultural communication differences helps to sustain stereotypic interpersonal judgments and contributes to conflict in interracial encounters" (p. 172).

Rankis and Biggers (1982) investigated North American, Latin American, and Caribbean business professionals in studies that focused on the perceived communication problems during intercultural business communication. Those business people were asked to assess their international counterparts in terms of various communication variables including differences in nonverbal behavior. There were some similarities as well as differences in the perceptions of their communication. However, differences in communication behaviors that are not mutually recognized negatively affected the negotiations between the executives. Taken together with the findings from LaFrance and Mayo's study, the results suggest that the first

step in the successful intercultural communication is to be more sensitive to communicative behaviors of self and others, then accept the differences without labeling them negatively.

Booth-Butterfield and Jordan (1989) investigated communication adaptation in intercultural encounters. In this study, communication patterns of black women and white women in racially homogeneous groups and their interaction patterns in racially heterogeneous groups were compared. Black women in same-race groups communicated more expressively overall than white women in same-race groups. Both groups altered their behaviors in mixed-race groups. The amount of change from same-race to mixed-race was about equal for blacks and whites, and the direction of the change was convergent. Communication adaptation in intercultural encounters was also mentioned in Miyahira's study (1991) on communication patterns in Japanese-American student dyads. An American student pointed out: "The Japanese act differently with other Japanese from the way they act with Americans. They become louder with Americans" (p. 23).

3. *Practical Applications*. This category is further divided into two subcategories: applications for business communication and pedagogy. Typically, these studies offered an overview of intercultural communication including nonverbal aspects, and provided suggestions for a necessary training program or class designed to develop intercultural sensitivity and competence in intercultural communication.

All of the research in business communication mentioned the increase of firms doing business abroad or the increase of multinational corporations as a rationale for intercultural training program. Rankis and Beebe (1982) noted that the North American expatriate executives' ignorance and insensitivity to nonverbal behavior of host cultures might be one of the factors contributing to their high attrition rate. Baird and Stull (1981) emphasized the need for universal cross cultural skills development, and introduced the program to train supervisors in multinational corporations. The program consisted of three stages including practicing and role-playing such cultural awareness skills as empathy and certain nonverbal cues (e.g., eye contact, facial expressions, head nods, and tone of voice). "It is not enough to just be aware of

cultural differences. Complete cultural sensitivity involves the ability to actually apply skills to particular cultures" (p. 11).

Similarly, Waltman (1984) noted the need for business communication specialists to develop instruction for sojourners' nonverbal fluency. Waltman also stated that the difficulty of nonverbal communication could be attributed to lack of awareness and improper training. Training objectives should include knowledge of sources of nonverbal communication, empathy, and developing the ability to show empathy, to tolerate ambiguity, to show respect, and to take turns. As an intercultural communication consultant and trainer for Japanese corporations, Goldman (1990) led role plays and simulations of Japanese-U.S. negotiations in which the Nissan managers practiced looking "Americans" (played by Japanese trainees) directly in the eye.

Instructions in intercultural communication at college level also seem to have emerged partly from pragmatic need. Two studies described how to teach intercultural concepts in business communication course (Gibbs, Hulbert, Hewing, Dortch, Pearson, & Ramsey, 1988; Harcourt, 1988). These authors stated the first objective of the course in a very similar manner: "Explain the increasing importance of intercultural communication" (Gibbs et al., p. 4); "To appreciate the increasing importance of international business communication" (Harcourt, p. 11). Both classes contained a unit which focused on cultural differences in nonverbal communication. The course designed by Gibbs et al. contained a role playing exercise to help students become aware of spatial differences among cultures. A survey conducted by Beebe and Biggers (1986) confirmed that many who teach a course in intercultural communication include a unit on nonverbal communication.

Another noticeable body of research on intercultural nonverbal communication from a pedagogical point of view deals with foreign language classrooms. The studies can be classified into two types: those concerned with teaching culture-specific body language and those concerned with teaching gestures used by teachers. Studies which belong to the former emphasize the importance of incorporating nonverbal behavior of the target culture into foreign language instruction. Davis (1988) contends that cultural gestures need to be taught in a foreign

language classroom because people may rely more on nonverbal cues in intercultural communication than in intracultural exchanges, and it is imperative that students can "recognize and interpret visual as well as auditory cues" (p. 4). Because "lacking nonverbal expertise or 'literacy' in another culture can lead to miscommunication even if the non-native speaker is highly competent linguistically in the language of the host culture" (p. 6), students should be instructed not only to recognize and interpret nonverbal cues in social context but also to actively produce them so that they can develop a "second language personality" (p 5). Davis suggested the use of such materials as television programs, photographs, and printed foreign advertisements. Similarly, Morain (1978) claims that those who have "learned" a language without including the nonverbal component are seriously handicapped if they are to interact with living members of the culture instead of with paper and print. Green (1971) and Pennycook (1985) also emphasized the need to teach foreign-culture gestures.

Barnett (1983) argued for more effective use of teaching gestures in the unique situation in foreign language classrooms where nonverbal communication inherently plays a major role. Barnett (1983) states that foreign language teachers should utilize more nonverbal cues to change the tempo and atmosphere of the class, reduce teacher talk, and furthermore, personalize instruction.

There are limited number of studies which investigate teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior in intercultural learning environment. These studies will be discussed in a separate section.

Limitations of Previous Intercultural Nonverbal Research

Intercultural communication research has provided us with some important information about differences and similarities in nonverbal behaviors across cultures. Particularly, studies which examined interactants' perceptions of a certain intercultural interaction and negative evaluation of the other person offered meaningful implications for the future research. The increased attention to intercultural communication in recent years seems to be an indication of a promising future of this field. However, there are some issues which need to be addressed.

1. No schema has been used theoretically to explain cultural differences in intercultural nonverbal communication observed in past research. In recent years, researchers have called for more attention to theory in the field of intercultural communication as a whole (e.g., Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Chua, 1988), however, researchers in intercultural-interpersonal-verbal communication at least have shared some dimensions of cultural variability (e.g., high- and low-context cultures, individualism-collectivism) and utilized them to explain observed phenomena. Intercultural nonverbal communication research seems to be lacking it. Findings of the research have not been organized in a particular systematic way. The field needs a shared perspective in order for the research findings to be integrated.

2. More research is needed that is interactive in nature. Under the category of intercultural communication, there are two basic kinds of studies: comparative and interactive (Gudykunst et al., 1988). In comparative research, patterns of communication found in a specific culture are compared to those of another culture. Representative research of this type is Ekman's studies on facial expressions related to emotion. Description of nonverbal characteristics in a certain culture (e.g., personal distance in Arab culture) falls under this category. Although this kind of knowledge is crucial in understanding the process of intercultural communication, comparative studies do not depict dynamic interaction between people from different cultural backgrounds. Communication is a process which involves mutual interaction, therefore, to call comparative studies "intercultural" research seems somewhat false. Interactive research examines communication which happens whenever a person encounters the other from a different culture. More research of this type is needed.

3. It is surprising that virtually no study has explicitly examined the effect of language differences in intercultural encounters. If interactants do not share the same first language, at least one party has to use a foreign language unless they attempt to communicate exclusively through nonverbal cues. It is likely that a person's nonverbal behavior is modified in accordance with the language being used. Future research should consider this issue so that it can be detected if a person's nonverbal behavior is different than usual.

4. Typical research investigating universals and differences in emotion represented by facial expressions has provided us with valuable information, however, it would be more meaningful to interpret these cues in context. Research on facial expressions taken out of context has only a limited value. Important cultural differences should be found not only in what meaning is conveyed by a certain facial expression, but also in how it is presented in a way appropriate in a given culture. This type of research is criticized form a different point of view by Baird and Stull (1981) that "universalistic position underscores the importance of being able to demonstrate certain universal feelings and in the appropriate contexts" (p. 4).

5. Some studies which discuss nonverbal behavior in foreign language classrooms are not very clear about the use of the term "nonverbal communication." They should make a clear distinction between cultural nonverbal behavior that is used by the people in the target culture and those nonverbal cues teachers use to facilitate learning.

Review of the Literature on Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in Intercultural Communication

The past research on teacher immediacy was based primarily on homogeneous samples of white students. Recently, some researchers have started to consider culture and its effect on immediacy in instructional communication. These researchers (e.g., Collier & Powell, 1990; Powell & Harville, 1990; Sanders & Wiseman, 1990) provide rationale for their research in a very similar manner. Today's classrooms are experiencing major cultural shifts: they are becoming increasingly ethnically and culturally diverse. And as the research just reviewed suggests, culture plays a major role in how we interpret the communication of others. Yet, the bulk of instructional communication literature does not reflect this cultural diversity. In his arousal-valence theory of immediacy, Andersen (1985) suggests that a culture is a primary influence on valence of the arousal generated in response to a certain immediacy behavior. Sanders and Wiseman (1990) explain this well: "if the arousal change is as a result of a culturally inappropriate behavior for the receiver, negative valence will occur" (p. 344). Then, if people from different cultural backgrounds evaluate the same communicative act differently,

the effects of teacher immediacy behaviors are likely to have diverse results depending on students' cultures.

An early study conducted by Kleinfeld (1973) examined the effects of teacher nonverbal warmth on the ninth grade Eskimo and white students. The teacher's nonverbal warmth (i.e., smiling and close body distance) affected student learning (i.e., recall of information) for both Eskimo and white students. For both Eskimo and white female students, teacher warmth led to more student verbalness (i.e., longer answers to questions). The greatest increase was shown for Eskimo female students.

Kleifgen (1988) conducted a study on interaction between teachers and international children with limited English proficiency, and reported that a Korean kindergarten child felt extremely uncomfortable because the teacher did not understand his desire to "preserve a certain personal space between him and his teacher as a signal of respect" (p. 222). Toupin (1980) stated that nonphysical movements and rituals were part of Asians' implicit nonverbal language. Powell and Collier (1990, in Powell & Harville, 1990) also found that Asian college students were negatively affected by teachers who established close physical distance while teaching.

Sanders and Wiseman (1990) investigated the effects of teacher immediacy for students from four domestic culture groups: Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks. In sum, teacher immediacy behaviors enhanced the students' perceived cognitive, affective and behavioral learning in the multicultural classroom. However, both similarities and differences in the effects of teacher immediacy emerged across groups. Three significant differences were: (1) For the White, Asian, and Hispanic ethnic groups, immediacy was more predictive of affective learning than behavioral learning; (2) Immediacy was more predictive of affective learning for Hispanic students than for Asian and Black students; and (3) For Hispanic students, immediacy was more associated with affective learning than with cognitive learning. While some immediacy cues (i.e., vocal expressiveness, smiling and eye contact) had pancultural effects on student learning, other held particular salience only for certain ethnicities.

Powell and Harville (1990) investigated the relationship between teacher immediacy and clarity, and their effects on student attitudes and behavioral intent for White, Latino, and Asian-American students. Overall, both verbal and nonverbal immediacy were related to teacher clarity. Immediacy played a greater role in the judgment of clarity for Latinos and Asians than for whites. Nonverbal immediacy had the highest correlations with willingness to enroll in a course of similar content for Latinos and Asian-Americans. Also, nonverbal immediacy had a high correlation with the evaluation of the instructor for Asians. However, Powell and Harville (1990) pointed out the low reliabilities of the nonverbal measure (especially for the Asians) and attributed the error to the role of culture, suggesting that the Asians, due to different expectations shaped by culture, had difficulty understanding what was being measured.

Collier and Powell (1990) examined how students' ethnic backgrounds (i.e., Anglo-American, Latino, African-American, and Asian-American) relate to their views of teacher nonverbal immediacy, effectiveness, and course utility at different points in a term. Results indicate that immediacy serves different functions for students from different ethnic backgrounds at different times in the course. Specifically, Anglo-Americans viewed the course as less useful toward the end of the term, and immediacy and effectiveness were strongly related throughout the course. For Latinos, immediacy was important earlier in the course, and views of teaching effectiveness dropped over time. An evolutionary interpretation seems to be appropriate for African Americans whose views of immediacy, effectiveness and course utility became more positive over time, and judgments earlier in the course appeared to be causally related to later judgments. For Asian-Americans, the relationship was stable in that immediacy influenced judgments of effectiveness, and effectiveness influenced judgments of course utility. Furthermore, these relationships were stable over time.

According to Burgoon and Hale's (1988) nonverbal expectancy violations model, people hold expectations and preferences about the nonverbal behaviors of others, and these expectations are based upon the cultural backgrounds of the interactants. In this light, Ikeda (1991) conducted an exploratory investigation and found that American college students tend to

expect American teachers to be slightly more immediate than Japanese teachers. Using a 16-item questionnaire Ikeda also found that students strongly prefer a Japanese teacher's "authentic Japanese" nonverbal behavior, and do not want nonverbal behavior modified for foreigners. The subjects also seemed to validate previous immediacy research conclusions; they preferred highly immediate behaviors regardless of whether the teacher was Japanese or American.

Limitations of the Research on Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in Intercultural Communication

These studies reviewed in the above section are significant for several reasons. First, they provide a convincing rationale for conducting intercultural instructional research. As these researchers point out, the past research has investigated teacher immediacy behavior that are assumed to be effective by "mainstream" students, and treated these teacher behaviors as if they would function similarly for all students regardless of their cultural backgrounds and other factors. By including cultural variables in their investigations, these researchers have contributed to the first step in this important area in the study of instructional communication. Second, last three studies (Collier & Powell, 1990; Powell & Harville, 1990; Sanders & Wiseman, 1990) differ from earlier studies on teacher immediacy in the use of terminology. In the early research, some terms were occasionally used in a somewhat misleading manner, however, in these studies, the vocabulary accurately represents what is being studied. For example, the word "behavioral intent" was used instead of "behavioral learning", and "perceived learning" instead of "learning." Although these studies are useful, there are some issues that need to be addressed.

1. Sample size for each ethnic group should be larger to ensure reliability. Also, the sample size for each group tends to lack balance. Even though a certain ethnic group is not easily accessible in a certain area, an effort should be made to obtain a certain number of subjects for each ethnic group represented.

2. The degree of subjects' acculturation into American society has not been considered although it may affect the way they interpret and evaluate nonverbal behavior.

3. So far, only students' cultural backgrounds have been examined, however, teachers' cultural backgrounds should be also investigated in the future; the study by Ikeda (1991) is the sole exception. The number of foreign faculty, though gradually, seems to be increasing. However, the effects of nonverbal behaviors of these instructors on student learning are unknown.

4. The research seems to be lacking an underlying theoretical framework.

Suggestions for Future Research in Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in Intercultural Communication

Until quite recently, studies on teacher immediacy have neglected the effects of cultural backgrounds of the teacher and students. A few researchers have started to investigate relationships between teacher immediacy and student learning in culturally diverse classrooms, however, this kind of research has just begun and the number is very few. In the future, more research should be conducted in this area. Several specific suggestions are offered.

1. Most studies which investigated relationships between teacher immediacy and learning outcomes of culturally diverse students have utilized relatively small samples. Larger sample size is needed for each cultural group investigated.

2. So far, no study has investigated the effects of a teacher's cultural background. Researchers should explore this variable while continuing to replicate the studies which examine the impact of students' cultural backgrounds.

3. Future research should include international students as the subjects as well as domestic ethnic groups.

4. When investigating learning outcomes gained by "ethnic" students or nonverbal behavior of a "foreign" teacher, the degree of their cultural acculturation should be measured.

5. The ultimate utility of cross-cultural studies lies in interactive studies which investigate communication between people from different cultures. However, since cross-cultural research in instructional communication is still scarce, studies that are comparative should be conducted as well. In other words, we should possess the knowledge about how a teacher and students interact in a classroom in different cultures, and then based upon that

knowledge, investigate an interaction process between a teacher and students who do not share the same culture.

6. Since culture is assumed to influence the way people hold expectations about others' behavior, and those expectations are assumed to influence the way people respond to others' actual behavior, incorporating an "expectation" variable (i.e., teacher expectation about students and student expectations about a teacher in terms of their cultural backgrounds) into the study of teacher nonverbal immediacy seems very salient.

7. Consistent measurement of learning outcomes should be established for each domain of student learning.

8. Accurate terms should be used (especially when reporting findings about student learning). The terms should accurately represent the construct measured by a given method. For example, if a researcher asked students' intent to employ communication practice suggested in the course, the term "behavioral intent" should be used instead of "behavioral learning."

9. Researchers should seek a theoretical framework to guide them in explaining relationships between teacher immediacy and student learning.

Conclusion

Mobility in today's world has increased an opportunity for intercultural communication. Traditionally, encounters with people from different cultures were limited to relatively few people. However, contact among cultures has significantly increased and is likely to continue increasing in many contexts, including academic situations. It has become extremely important that one can communicate effectively with people who possess communication patterns different from one's own. However, intercultural communication is not easy. One of the obstacles is individuals' tendency to judge people from other cultures by the standards and customs of their own culture. The result of this ethnocentrism is misunderstanding, stereotyping, and conflict (Jensen, 1988).

Since nonverbal cues play an important role in communication, knowledge about nonverbal behavior in other cultures and the ability to utilize appropriate nonverbal cues in intercultural encounters are crucial. Although there has been a considerable amount of research on intercultural nonverbal communication, they have not been sufficient to identify dynamics of intercultural communication and help people behave effectively in intercultural encounters. Particularly, research on nonverbal communication in intercultural classrooms has been almost nonexistent. It is understandable given the complexity of the nonverbal dimension of communication patterns in the classroom multiplied by the complexity of intercultural communication. However, the research is needed for more effective communication. Teachers should be sensitive to the needs of culturally diverse students because nonverbal immediacy behaviors of teachers seem to affect students differently depending on the students' (and the teacher's) cultural backgrounds.

Research on teachers' nonverbal communication in intercultural learning environment is imperative. Knowledge obtained from cross-cultural studies will help us understand the mechanism of complex interaction. Such knowledge is helpful not only in interpreting behaviors of people from other cultures, but also in becoming aware of how one's own culture is likely to be stereotyped (Wolfgang, 1984). Thus teachers would be able to modify the behavior, if necessary, to facilitate student learning.

Bibliography

Andersen, J. F. 1978. The relationship between teacher immediacy and teaching effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.

Andersen, J. F. 1979. Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In B. Ruben (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 3*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books: 543-559.

Andersen, J. F., Norton, R. W., & Nussbaum, J. F. 1981. Three investigations exploring relationships between perceived teacher communication behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education, 30*: 377-392.

Andersen, J. F., & Withrow, J. G. 1981. The impact of lecturer nonverbal expressiveness on improving mediated instruction. *Communication Education, 30*: 342-353.

Andersen, P. A. 1985. Nonverbal immediacy in interpersonal communication. In A. W. Seigman & S. Feldstein (Eds.), *Multichannel integrations of nonverbal behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Elrbaum: 1-36.

Baird, J. W., & Stull, J. B. 1981, May. *Communication effectiveness in multinational organizations: Developing universal intercultural skills*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Barnett, M. 1983. Replacing teacher talk with gestures: Nonverbal communication in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 16*: 173-176.

Barnlund, D. C. 1989. *Communicative styles of Japanese and Americans*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishers.

Beebe, S. A., & Biggers, T. 1990. *Applications of implicit communication theory for the classroom*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Dublin, Ireland.

Beebe, S. A. & Biggers, T. 1986. The status of the intercultural communication course. *Communication Education, 35*: 56-60.

Beebe, S. A. 1986. The role of nonverbal communication in the classroom. *The Florida Speech Communication Journal*, 16 (2): 2-15.

Booth-Butterfield, M., & Jordan, F. 1989. Communication adaptation among racially homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. *Southern Communication Journal, 54*: 253-272.

Boyer, L. M., Thompson, C. A., Klopf, D. W., & Ishii, S. 1990. An intercultural comparison of immediacy among Japanese and Americans. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 71*: 65-66.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. 1988. Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. *Communication Monographs, 55*: 58-79.

Butland, M. 1991. A study of the application of implicit communication theory to teacher immediacy and student learning. M.A. Thesis, Southwest Texas State University.

Christophel, D. M. 1990. The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education, 39*: 323-340.

Collier, M. J. 1988. A comparison of conversations among and between domestic culture groups: How intra- and intercultural competencies vary. *Communication Quarterly, 36*: 122-144.

Collier, M. J., & Powell, R. 1990. Ethnicity, instructional communication and classroom systems. *Communication Quarterly, 38*: 334-349.

Davis, J. 1988. *Teaching cultural gestures in the foreign language classroom: A review of literature.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 501

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. 1971. Constants across cultures in the face and emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17*: 124-129.

Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., O'Sullivan, M., Chan, A., Diacoyanni-Tarlatzis, I., Heider, K., Krause, R., LeCompte, W. A., Pitcairn, T., Ricci-Bitti, P. E., Scherer, K., Tomita, M., & Tzavaras, A. 1987. Universals and cultural differences in the judgments of facial expressions of emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*: 712-717.

French, R. L. 1971. Analyzing and improving nonverbal communication: A model for inservice education. *Theory into Practice, 10*: 305-309.

Galloway, C. M. 1971. The challenge of nonverbal research. *Theory into Practice, 10*: 310-314.

Galloway, C. M. 1974. Nonverbal teacher behaviors: A critique. *American Educational Research Journal, 11*: 305-306.

Galloway, C. M. 1984. Nonverbal and teacher-student relationships: An intercultural perspective. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Nonverbal behavior: Perspectives, applications, intercultural insights*. Lewiston, NY: C. J. Hogrefe: 411-430.

Gibbs, M., Hulbert, J., Hewing, P., Dortch, N., Pearson, P., & Ramsey, D. 1988. How to teacher intercultural concepts in a basic business communication class. *Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication, 51* (3): 2-7.

Goldman, A. 1990, November. *Intercultural consulting and training in Japan: Implications for U. S.—Japanese communication.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Gorham, J. 1988. The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behavior and student learning. *Communication Education, 37*: 40-53.

Gorham, J., & Zakahi, W. R. 1990. A comparison of teacher and student perceptions of immediacy and learning: Monitoring process and product. *Communication Education, 39*: 354-368.

Green, J. R. 1971. A focus report: Kinesics in the foreign-language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 5*: 62-68.

Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Chua, E. 1988. *Culture and interpersonal communication.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hackman, M. Z., & Walker, K. B. 1990. Instructional communication in the televised classroom: The effects of system design and teacher immediacy on student learning and satisfaction. *Communication Education, 39*: 196-206.

Hall, E. T. 1976. *Beyond culture*. New York: Doubleday.

Harcourt, J. 1988. A new cross-cultural communication course: Communicating in the international business environment. *Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication, 51* (3): 11-13.

Hirokawa, R. Y., & Miyahara, A. 1986. A comparison of influence strategies utilized by managers in American and Japanese organizations. *Communication Quarterly, 34*: 250-265.

Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ikeda, T. 1991. "Teacher nonverbal immediacy: A call for intercultural research." Unpublished research paper. Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, TX.

Jensen, M. D. 1988. *Guidelines for cross-cultural communication between students and faculty*. Report No. CS 505 179. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 595

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., & Wendt-Wasco, N. J. 1985. Teacher immediacy for affective learning in divergent college classes. *Communicaiton Quarterly, 33*: 61-74.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Smith, V. R., & Sorensen, G. 1988. Effects of teacher immediacy and strategy type on college on-task demands. *Communication Education, 37*: 54-67.

Keating, C. F., Mazur, A., Segall, M. H., Cysneiros, P. G., Divale, W. T., Kilbride, J. E., Komin, S., Leahy, P., Thurman, B., & Wirsing, R. 1981. Culture and the perception of social dominance from facial expression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*: 615-626.

Kelley, D. H., & Gorham, J. 1988. Effects of immediacy on recall of information. *Communication Education, 37*: 198-207.

Kitao, S. K., & Kitao, K. 1988. Differences in the kinesic codes of American and Japanese. *World Communication, 17*: 83-102.

Kleifgen, J. A. 1988. Learning from student teachers' cross-cultural communicative failures. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 19*: 218-234.

Kleinfeld, J. 1973. *Using nonverbal warmth to increase learning: A cross-cultural experiment*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 081 568.

Klinzing, H. G., Fitzner, T., & Klinzing-Eurich, G. 1983. *Effects of a training program on expressive nonverbal behavior*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 999.

LaFrance, M., & Mayo, C. 1976. Racial differences in gaze behavior during conversation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33*: 547-552.

LaFrance, M., & Mayo, C. 1978. Gaze direction in interracial dyadic communication. *Ethnicity, 5*: 167-173.

Leathers, D. G. 1986. *successful nonverbal communication: Principles and applications*. New York: Macmillan.

Love, A. M., & Roderick, J. A. 1971. Teacher nonverbal communication: The development and field testing of an awareness unit. *Theory into Practice, 10*: 295-299.

Mehrabian, A. 1969. Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. *Behavioral Research Methods and Instrumentation, 1*: 213-217.

Mehrabian, A. 1971. *Silent messages*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Mehrabian, A. 1981. *Silent messages: Implicit communication of emotions and attitudes*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Miyahira, K. 1991, March. *Needs profiles of intercultural communication competence in Japanese-American student dyads*. Paper presented at the Intercultural and International Communication Conference: Communication in Japan and the United States, Fullerton, CA.

Morain, G. G. 1978. *Kinesics and cross-cultural understanding. Language in education: Theory and practice*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 157 405.

Nussbaum, J. F. 1983. Systematic modification of teacher behavior. In R. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 7*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage: 672-684.

Nussbaum, J. F., Comadena, M. E., & Holladay, S. J. 1985, May. *Verbal and nonverbal behavior of highly effective teachers*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Honolulu, HI.

Pennycook, A. 1985. Actions speak louder than words: Paralanguage, communication, and education. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*: 259-282.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. 1986. Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. *Communication Education, 35*: 43-55.

Powell, R. G., & Harville, B. 1990. The effects of teacher immediacy and clarity on instructional outcomes: An intercultural assessment. *Communication Education, 39*: 369-379.

Rankis, O. E., & Beebe, S. A. 1982, November. *Expatriate executive failure: An overview of the underlying causes*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, KY.

Rankis, O. E., & Biggers, T. J. 1982. *Interpersonal perception in international business negotiations: An update*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 235 531.

Richey, H. W., & Richey, M. H. 1978. Nonverbal behavior in the classroom. *Psychology in the Schools, 15*: 571-576.

Richmond, V. P. 1990. Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. *Communication Education, 39*: 181-195.

Richmond, V. P, Gorham, J. S., & McCroskey, J. C. 1987. The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. In R. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 10*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage: 574-590.

Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. Eds. 1988. *Intercultural communication: A reader* (5th ed.. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sanders, J. A., & Wiseman, R. L. 1990. The effects of verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy on perceived cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning in the multicultural classroom. *Communication Education, 39*: 341-353.

Sato, A. 1991, March. *An aspect of Japanese behavior as regards person-to-person distance.* Paper presented at the Intercultural and International Communication Conference: Communication in Japan and the United States, Fullerton, CA.

Seals, J. M., & Kaufman, P. A. 1975. Effects of nonverbal behavior on student attitudes in the college classroom. *The Humanist Educator, 14*: 51-55.

Smith, H. A. 1979. Nonverbal Communication in Teaching. *Review of Educational Research, 49*: 631-672.

Stewart, R. A. 1989. Interaction effects of teacher enthusiasm and student notetaking on recall and recognition of lecture content. *Communication Research Reports, 6*: 84-89.

Stewart, R. A., & Wheeless, L. R. 1987. Relationship between teacher immediacy and student/teacher solidarity: Its generalizability across divergent instructional contexts. *Communication Research Reports, 4*: 47-52.

Sweeney, M. A., & Cottle, W. C., & Kobayashi, M. J. 1980. Nonverbal communication: A cross-cultural comparison of American and Japanese counseling students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 150-156.

Toupin, E. S. W. A. 1980. Counseling Asians: Psychotherapy in the context of racism and Asian-American history. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 50*: 76-86.

Waltman, J. L. 1984. Nonverbal elements of international business communication. In R. D. Ramsey (Ed.), *Professional Communication in the Modern World: Proceedings of the 31st American Business Communication Association Southeast Convention.* Hammond, LA: 53-58.

Wiemann, M. O., & Wiemann, J. M. 1975. *Nonverbal communication in the Elementary Classroom* Urbana, Ill.: Eric Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills ERIC No. ED 113 771.

Willett, T. 1976. A descriptive analysis of nonverbal beahviors of classroom teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Wolfgang, A. 1984. State of the art of nonverbal behavior in intercultural counseling. In A. Wolfgang (Ed.), *Nonverbal behavior: Perspectives, applications, intercultural insights.* Lewiston, NY: C. J. Hogrefe: 335-349.

Woolfolk, R. L., & Woolfolk, A. E. 1974. Effects of teacher verbal and nonverbal behaviors on student perceptions and attitudes. *American Educational Research Journal, 11*: 297-303.